10, ll 60-62). No teaching or suggestion is given by Thompson that either resident memory 84 or 284 interface with an integrated circuit, with which "a call-answering functionality is enabled by the microcontroller in combination with the digital voice memory" as featured in claim 3.

Moreover, assuming the alternative correlation in the Office Action of the program memory 184 to the claimed digital voice memory, this memory 184 also does not equate to the claimed subject matter. Instead, the program memory 184, which is contained within an application module 100, is used in conjunction with the module 100 to provide a number of different applications. None of the applications disclosed by Thompson includes a call-answering functionality, much less a call-answering functionality enabled by the microcontroller in combination with a digital voice memory. Furthermore, the program memory 184 contains the application and software programs and is not a digital speech memory. Thus, based on the foregoing reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 3 is not anticipated by Thompson.

With respect to claims 4-6, these claims are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency upon independent claim 3.

With respect to independent claim 7, this claim is also believed to be allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to independent claim 3. Additionally, dependent claims 8-10 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency upon independent claim 7.

In light of the foregoing comments, the Applicant submits that claims 3-10 are allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY _____

Patrick B. Law
Reg. No. 41,549
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 781-6801